DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 383 797 UD 030 468

AUTHOR Howell, John F.
TITLE Using Profiles To Improve Schools.
INSTITUTION Springfield Public Schools, Mass.
PUB DATE 20 Apr 95
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 18-22, 1995).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Attendance; *Decision Making; Educational Change; *Educational Improvement; Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; *Profiles; Public Schools; School Statistics; *Standards; Student Characteristics; Test Results
IDENTIFIERS *Educational Indicators; *Springfield Public Schools MA

ABSTRACT

As part of an effort to improve Springfield (Massachusetts) public schools, School Centered Decision Making Teams (SCDMT) have been created at each school. To help the SCDMTs produce more meaningful and useful School Improvement Plans (SIPs), the school system has been working to produce a profile for each school. The availability of profiles was a way to both show the needs of a school as well as hold the school accountable to certain goals and objectives. The goal of profiles is not to allow comparisons of schools, but to enlist the support of teachers, parents, and administrators in improving instruction. The profile eventually developed included information on average student attendance; teacher absences; student, parent, and teacher attitude; academic achievement; retention percentage; and some information about student activities and plans. A school system standard, a value for the school, and the degree of change were included for each profile indicator. All schools in the system produced school improvement plans for 1992-93 and 1993-94, and all used their profiles to some degree when developing their plans. Three tables present sample profiles and profile areas. An appendix lists 40 items from the survey used to develop the sample profile. (Contains 5 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 383 797

SPRINGFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Springfield, Massachusetts

Using Profiles to Improve Schools

John F. Howell,PH.D.
Director of Research

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John F. Howell
Springfield Public Schools
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

WA 304 68

A paper presented to
THE AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION ANNUAL MEETING
San Francisco, CA April 20, 1995

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Using Profiles to Improve Schools

DISCOVERING THE PROFILE

For the past five years, under the direction of Superintendent, Peter J. Negroni, Springfield Public Schools have been attempting to improve the academic achievement of students through improving instruction and educational reform. One of the first actions that Superintendent Negroni took was to organize the schools into elementary schools (Grades K-5), K-8 Schools, middle Schools (Grades 6-8), and high schools. A second step was the creation of School Centered Decision Making Teams (SCDMT) at each school. Since then more and more important school decisions have been given to the SCDMT.

Early on each SCDMT was asked to examine outcome data for their schools to determine what needs existed, and, based on that information, to produce a School Improvement Plan (SIP). Schools previously were asked to write SIPs but most resulted in little school improvement. Part of the reason for this is that schools did not have data in a useful form from which to construct a meaningful SIP. Webster (1993) noted that "it is essential that the system provide (schools) with the information necessary to improve instruction" (p.15).

In the past schools were mandated as to the area of improvement, such as Reading, attendance, or the reduction of retentions and dropouts. The mandates were not necessarily supported with data or resources. And some schools, depending on certain demographic factors, were simply unable to improve in some areas. Because of this history, there was a general reaction from the schools that the newly created SCDMT should have the authority to select the variables for improvement at their school based on the needs of that school and the responsibility for writing a meaningful SIP that could be used to hold the school accountable. As a result, SCDMTs began requesting more information from the system, especially evaluation information.

The usual method of determining effectiveness of programs and changes has been to conduct an evaluation study. For many years resources were allocated to conduct such studies so that programs and policies might be changed for the better. Title I still does. More recently, evaluation studies have had to be eliminated due to inadequate funds. Funding has declined for evaluation studies mostly because too many evaluations have either been poorly done or have shown no program effect. (Many evaluation studies found it extremely difficult to control important independent variables in the face of pressing educational need.) How do you justify NOT replacing a child that has been successful in a given program with one that desperately needs the program? Evaluation validity and reliability were not considered justification enough.

SCDMTs requested other data collected by the system which typically had been published on lists as values for various variables, such as a list of attendance rates at each school, a list of retention rates, and lists of commercial test results. Schools were often discouraged by these lists since the differences more often than not reflected differences in the student bodies, differences in demographic variables, in those schools which rendered many comparisons unfair. Some schools never improved their relative position on such lists.

Springfield Schools tried to create "fair" comparisons among schools by using an ability test along with the achievement test, then, with other demographic information, to derive an "anticipated" achievement score to be compared to the actual achievement score. Thus, schools with low achievement scores due to demographic factors had as much chance to have a positive comparison score as some high achieving schools. Webster (1993) confirmed that "the only fair and equitable method of comparison among schools or districts is one that statistically adjusts the outcome (achievement) variables by the input (demographic) variables". But in a few years the procedure was abandoned. There was little satisfaction in having a host of children, dozens of months below grade level, achieving "up to their potential".

Efforts were made to find a way to present information to the schools that would allow them to produce meaningful and effective SIPs. In reviewing work by Collins (1991), Jaeger (1993) and Webster (1993), school indicator reports or profiles emerged as the best way to get data to the SCDMT in a useful form so they could construct a meaningful SIP for their school. Collins (1991) defined an educational indicator as "a statistic which provides information about the status or health of an educational system that can readily, reliably and repeatedly be obtained" (p.i). The system began work to produce a profile for each school so that the SCDMT could select for itself the areas of strength and weakness. School profiles were a way to both show the needs of a school as well as hold that school accountable to certain goals and objectives.

VARIABLES AND THE PROFILE

The first attempt at developing a profile for each school simply took the previously generated data sets, listed by school, and redistributed them school by school. This did not work! Angry principals pointed out that there were variables included on the profile that were NOT under the control of the school to change, demographic variables that merely described the school or the students. We had lots of lists of demographic variables!

Webster (1993) categorized three types of indicator variables. He defined some indicators as INPUT (demographic) variables, such as race, language, income level, staff characteristics, and financial resources. None of these variables are under the control of the school to change, but have an impact on other variables. Webster identified PROCESS indicators as goals, leadership, climate and professional development. His OUTCOME (achievement) indicators were, among others, academic performance, attendance, retention, parent satisfaction, enrollment in advanced courses and college attendance. While the INPUT variables clearly influence the OUTCOME variables, they are rarely changeable. Schools with certain percentages of limited English speakers are likely to have those percentages in the near future. And while OUTCOME variables are the ones that are to be changed, it is changes in the PROCESS variables that will more than likely make the difference. Schools, for instance, that participate in professional development activities to increase specific OUTCOME variables, impact that OUTCOME. If the OUTCOME is student achievement, then achievement improves.

If the profiles were to be used for school improvement, then INPUT (demographic) variables, such as race, ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic levels, teacher salaries, school financial appropriations, etc. should not be included. OUTCOME variables should be displayed and PROCESS variables should be manipulated in an ACTION PLAN detailing the procedures to be followed to accomplish the SIP. The profiles allowed each SCDMT to investigate just the variables that were most important to them and to determine which of them was most in need of special attention. Those variables formed the basis of their SIP. Schools were free to choose variables other than those on the profile, but with a dozen or more variables defined and measured, the profiles provided a ready source from which to choose.

PROFILES FOR THE SCDMT

In reviewing a host of school profiles it became apparent that the number one purpose for producing a profile was public relations. In fact, Jaeger (1993) in his study of school indicators, states, "The principal function of school report cards ... is to inform parents of children attending public schools about the quality, condition, and success of their children's schools in providing effective education." (p.3). In many cases it provides parents with useful information with which parents can make an informed choice of their children's school.

The second most important purpose for existing profiles is to report to the Board of Education, along with the public, for purposes of accountability. In his introduction to the Fairfax County Public Schools profile report, Superintendent Spillane (1989) writes, "I believe that the quantitative data and descriptive information provided in these profiles are valuable parts of the total picture. They convey a sense of each school's strengths in terms of student achievement, indicate performance changes which have occurred, and include factors that might contribute to overall school performance. School profiles promote accountability by providing a basis for meaningful dialog and collaboration." In addition to school data, school board members also want district and state level data for comparison.

Almost none of the many profiles reviewed were developed for the expressed purpose of helping schools improve instruction. That is to say, very few profiles were specifically developed by some district office for the exclusive use of school administrative personnel charged with developing some plan for the improvement of their school. Yet, this was the very tact that was taken in developing the profiles for Springfield Public Schools. The most important aspect of profiles, developed for this purpose, is that they meet the needs of each SCDMT involved in improving schools. The goal of displaying profiles is not to compare schools but to enlist the support of teachers, parents and the administration in improving instruction. A good first step that we took was to survey all the constituents in the identification of the variables. Which ones are important to teachers, parents, and the SCDMT? The survey is really just as important to building a consensus for change as in identifying variables. The survey identified INPUT variables that later proved to be less useful than OUTCOME variables.

COMPARISONS

Once the variables that were to be used on the profile were identified, data must be collected. In some areas, such as school climate (see Appendix), that meant collecting information for the first time. Several colleagues suggested converting the data to ranks and developing profiles based on ranks. Ranking allows good comparisons, but forces schools into a distribution. This can be alleviated somewhat by concurrently establishing "passing standards." In some cases, the various constituencies were asked to establish the criteria or "passing" levels, but most "standards" were simply past average performances.

Perhaps the most important discovery we made was that there are many ways to compare schools, and fairness may depend more on using several methods together rather than one that has been statistically engineered to be fair. In general there seem to be three major comparisons that schools can make to judge the worth of their labor. (1) Schools can compare their outcomes to like outcomes measured earlier, (2) to other like schools, or (3) to some outcome standard. Kaagan and Coley (1989) defined those three comparisons in this way; "The usefulness of an indicator rests on its ability to show what happens over time, what it can say about the performance of a school or district compared to other schools and districts, or how the condition it measures compares with societal needs or expectations." (p.7) The profiles, an example of which is shown on Table 1, were constructed using all three comparisons.

Schools really do want to compare themselves to one another much like students do after report cards are issued. To allow a school to compare its performance to other schools, all of the variables were put in rank order and divided into three groups. The first group, labeled "HIGH", represents the best performance of that variable by one third of the schools. The second group of schools, labeled "MID", represent average performance on that variable. The third group, labeled "LOW", represent those third of the schools that scored the lowest on the variable. The actual scores for each variable were also presented.

To allow a school to compare its performance to some criteria, a "Standard" level for each variable was established and presented with each Profile. When scores on a given variable exceed that standard, they were marked with a plus (+) after the score. The standards that were set were not chosen arbitrarily, but were often midpoints of scales or the averages that have been experienced by the system in years past.

In addition to these two comparisons, a third comparison was included, allowing a school to compare its performance at this time to its own previous performance. To that end, each profile contained, in the far right column, an indication of change coded as follows:

- \- Gone DOWN and changed by at least one category (third)
- \- Gone DOWN but remained in the same category (third)
- \+ Went UP but remained in the same category (third)
- \+ \+ Went UP and changed by at least one category (third)
- N/C NO Change
- N/A Comparative data does not exist

THE VARIABLES CHOSEN

The first variable depicted on Table 1, the Sample Composite Profile, is student attendance, AVE. STUDENT ATTEND. The standard was 92% representing a generally accepted 8% absentee rate due to illness.

Teacher attendance was divided into two variables, the median number of days that teachers are absent, MDN TEACHER ABSENT, and the median number of days that teachers are absent for reason of illness, MEDIAN TEACHER ILL. The first variable includes absences for conferences, workshops, etc. The standards were set as the system medians in 1992-93.

In 1993-94 and again in 1994-95 schools were asked to survey students, teachers and parents on items that were considered pertinent to school climate (see Appendix), STUDENT, TEACHER, PARENT ATTITUDE. The average from the first administration across all populations, 140, was used as the standard.

All schools in Massachusetts in Grades 4, 8, and 10, have had a curriculum assessment administered every other year for the past eight years. The Massachusetts Assessment of Educational Progress (MAEP) was modeled after the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). MAEP reports both norm referenced scores, READING, MATH, SCIENCE, SOCIAL STUDIES ASSESSMENT, and criterion referenced scores, READING, MATH, SCIENCE, SOC STUD, WRITING PROF LVL>2. The definitions of the criterion levels are:

- I Students begin to grasp factual knowledge, and have weak communication skills.
- II Students have a firm grasp factual knowledge, and developing communication skills.
- III Students are beginning to think critically, solve problems, reason and communicate effectively.
- IV Students exemplary in knowledge, thinking, reasoning and communicating.

The standard used was mastery defined as students who were judged to be at competency Levels III and IV, that is, on levels greater than 2.

For the past four years all students in Grades 3-8 (minus exclusions) have taken the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) Survey, Form K, GRADE 3-8 ACHIEVEMENT. The standard is the national norm at the seventh month (i.e. 3.7, 4.7, etc.). In addition, schools were asked to identify students who were enrolled for at least 100 days during the current school year, ATTENDERS, contrasted with those who were not, and to identify students who could be considered as economically disadvantaged, LOW SES. The scores of these subgroups were included as variables on the profile.

MATH PERFORMANCE in Grades 4 and 6 was measured by a norm-referenced, commercial performance measure. The standard set was the fiftieth percentile.

Each March 1 a census is taken of the number of students enrolled. Each year a headcount is kept of all the students served by each school. The ratio of the March 1 census and the headcount subtracted from 1 has been defined as the index of stability, STABILITY INDEX, the percent of the students remaining in the school from opening day to close. That percentage has been 87% on average for a long time.

The number of students that are not promoted, divided by the number of students enrolled on October 1, defines the percent of students retained in grade, PERCENT RETENTIONS. Typically 6% of a secondary school is not promoted. However, students not promoted can change that status by attending summer school. The new standard in elementary schools is 3%, usually clustered at the early grade levels.

In 1991, Springfield Public Schools introduced a new desegregation plan which incorporated a Controlled Choice Assignment Plan. Within certain broad parameters, parents could choose any school they wanted their children to attend if space and the racial composition of the school was available. Some schools were more popular than others, and those that were less popular were urged to improve their image and program offerings. Initially, 85% of the parents were granted their first choice of school, PCT ENROLL 1ST CHOICE. That has become the standard.

Part of the ITBS is a questionnaire regarding a number of issues related to test performance. Two of those issues are the amount of homework accomplished, HOMEWORK: 2 HOURS+, and the number of hours of television watched, TV 2 HOURS/DAY OR LESS. Secondary schools established the standard that 90% of their students should accomplish two hours of homework each night. All schools established that the maximum amount of television that should be watched per day is two hours. The percent of students who exceed these standards is reported.

Each school has been asked to have all students involved in some Community Service Learning (CSL) project, CSL PARTICIPATION. In 1992-93, 70% of all students participated in some project.

Several years ago the system established several External Alternative Placement Centers, EAP PLACEMENTS, away from regular school buildings where students would be able to receive tutoring, counseling and social services for a few days in situations that might otherwise lead to a suspension from school. In 1991-92, an average of 100 students were sent to the EAP centers from each school. The standard, thus, was established at 100 or less placements.

DROPOUTS are students who leave school without completing any established program. Between 1980 and 1992, an average of 150 students became dropouts from each high school. It is hoped that each high school would have less than 150 dropouts per year.

Many college bound juniors are required to submit both Verbal and Math Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores for admission to college or university, VERB, MATH SAT SCORES. The average for Massachusetts from 1986-1990 was 430 and 476 respectively.

From 1980 to 1990, 51% of all of the graduates of Springfield Public Schools pursued some form of further education, FURTHER ED PLANS, while 37% pursued a career, FURTHER CAREER PLANS.

Table 1
SAMPLE COMPOSITE PROFILE

INDICATOR	STANDARD	HIGH	MID	LOW	CHANGE
AVE STUDENT ATTEND	92.0%		92.6%+		--
MDN TEACHER ABSENT*	>8	7+			-
MEDIAN TEACHER ILL*	>5		4+		--
STUDENT ATTITUDE	140.0		142.5+		-
TEACHER ATTITUDE	140.0	151.0+			++
PARENT ATTITUDE	140.0	146.0+			-
READING ASSESSMENT	1350			1170	--
MATH ASSESSMENT	1330			1190	N/C
SCIENCE ASSESSMENT	1350			1200	--
S.STUDIES ASSESSMENT	1340		1220		--
READING PROF LVL>2	22%			6%	--
MATH PROF LVL>2	17%			0%	--
SCIENCE PROF LVL>2	19%		6%		--
SOC STUD PROF LVL>2	18%			6%	--
WRITING PROF LVL>2	16%			2%	+
GRADE 3 ACHIEVEMENT	3.7			3.3	--
ATTENDERS	3.7		3.4		
LOW SES	3.7		3.2		
GRADE 4 ACHIEVEMENT	4.7		4.4		-
ATTENDERS	4.7		4.4		
LOW SES	4.7		4.3		
GRADE 5 ACHIEVEMENT	5.7			4.8	+
ATTENDERS	5.7			4.8	
LOW SES	5.7			4.5	
(Also Grades 6,7,8,10)					
MATH PERFORMANCE	50			50	--
STABILITY INDEX	87%		84%		-
PERCENT RETENTIONS*	>6%			7.6%	-
PCT ENROLL 1ST CHOICE	85%		91%+		--
HOMEWORK: 2 HOURS+	90%			87%	N/A
TV 2 HOURS/DAY OR LESS	40%		27%		N/A
CSL PARTICIPATION (Secondary only)	70%	91%+			N/C
EAP PLACEMENTS*	>100	31+			-
DROPOUTS*	>150			317	-
VERB SAT SCORES	430			315	--
MATH SAT SCORES	476		380		+
FURTHER ED PLANS	51%		68%+		+
FURTHER CAREER PLANS	37%			13%	-

* For Standards preceded by ">", low values are regarded as "HIGH".

RESULTS

All schools in the system produced a School Improvement Plan (SIP) in 1992-93 and again in 1993-94 and presented their plans publicly to the School Committee each June. All SCDMTs used the profiles to some degree or another in constructing those plans. For the first time all schools had a SIP that involved the entire school community and had a reasonable chance to produce meaningful changes. What were those changes for 1993-94?

First, ever since the number of students who are retained in grade has been an issue concurrent with the reform initiative to find other ways to give some students more time to achieve than to have them repeat a grade, the number of elementary students retained has dropped to almost one quarter of number retained just a few years earlier. Second, student attendance at the elementary level has gone up.

When all of the SIPs had been constructed and delivered to the School Committee in public, an examination was made of choices that each SCDMT made. Most elementary schools chose to improve in the area of language; most secondary schools wanted to reduce dropouts or retentions. Those choices, ranked 1, 2 or 3 are shown for each school (listed by code) on Table 2. More than three variables were selected in some cases, but the top three were identified for examination here. For example, School #500 chose to improve the number of dropouts as their first priority, to improve the school climate as the second priority, and to improve attendance as their third priority. The pluses and minuses are consistent with the designation of change used on the profiles described above (Page 4). The school failed to decrease the number of dropouts (in fact had considerably more than the year before), did not improve its climate, but did have better student attendance. School #165 improved in all three areas selected.

Table 2
Profile School Improvement Plan Ranked Areas

Code	Math	Read	Lang	Science	Soc.Stud	Climate	Attnd	Drop
500						2-	3+	1--
510								1++
620						1+		
470							1-	
310							2+	1++
320								1++
325							2+	1++
328				2-			1+	3++
330		1-				2-		
010	2-			3++		1++		
015				1++				
175	3++	1+				2+		
020	1++	2++		3+				
025				1++				
030				1--			2++	
035				1++				
045	3++	2++		1--				
050	1++	3++				2+		
060				1--				
075				1++				
195				2+			1++	
065	1++			2++		3+		
070	1+					2++		
080				2+		1-		
085		2+		1--				
100				1--				
055		1+		3+		2-		
110						1--		
115	1++							
120		1--		2--		3++		
140	2+			1-			3-	
125	1+				2++			
145				1-				
160	3+	1++		2--				
165	2+	1+		3+				
155				2+		3+	1++	
180				1+				
185	3++	1++				2+		
190	1-			2-		3+		
095					1+	2+	3++	

All of the pluses and minuses are tabulated in Table 3. A Chisquared analysis was performed on the above data but pooled to a two by six table since 82% of the cells above have an expected frequency less than 5.0. That Chisquared analysis showed no dependence between evidence of improvement and area selected for improvement.

Table 3
Contingency Table for Table 1 Changes

Change	Math	Read	Lang	Sci	SocS	Clim	Attnd	Drop	Total
--	0	1	7	0	0	1	0	1	10
-	2	1	4	0	0	4	2	0	13
+	5	4	6	2	1	7	4	0	29
++	7	5	6	1	0	4	3	5	31
Total	14	11	23	3	1	16	9	6	83

However 60 of 83 changes (72%) were either + or ++, suggesting that school improvement did occur in areas that the schools selected for improvement. Reports from the schools indicated that the profiles were useful in highlighting areas for schools to concentrate their improvement efforts.

FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS

Improvements in our profiles need to occur in several areas. (1) The variables now identified need to be refined. (2) More OUTCOME variables need to be included and maybe even some quasi- INPUT variables. (3) The profiles desperately need to be presented in a better form with more narrative and some graphics.

The attitude/climate scale (see Appendix) is not the best means to measure either professional attitude or school climate. It was chosen because it was available and easy to use. It had enough technical merit to warrant its use, but it would be worthwhile to develop or acquire several more focused measures of both attitude and climate.

Community Service Learning participation should reflect the number of hours that students are involved and not just the number of students. Further suggestions were made to measure the quality in Community Service Learning and not just participation.

The measure of career and education plans needs to be replaced with data that shows exactly what the graduation class was doing after one year. Even the best laid plans often go astray.

Finally, the Math Performance Assessment was a large success both in terms of generating some interesting scores, but also in giving teachers a whole new way to look at mathematics achievement. It would be beneficial to have several such assessments in different curriculum areas and grade levels. It would also be instructive to have teachers develop a number of performance assessment tasks. For the profile, each assessment depends upon rubrics for scoring. These rubric scores could be aggregated into a school average. Teacher rating of observed performance, without the standard prompts and tasks is also a way of generating performance data.

School profiles are never complete and only temporarily current. As new variables emerge they need to be inserted into the profiles. And occasionally, suggestions for new profile variables has sparked interest in other reform initiatives. What new variables could be added to the profiles soon?

There needs to be some measure of teacher quality and/or effectiveness that is public information. Teacher Education Level, which as been tried because it is easy to collect, has too little variability to be useful; secondary teachers have more education than elementary teachers. Are the best educated teachers the best teachers?

Various new evaluation protocols for teacher performance have been developed and could be used to generate some sort of quality index that could be aggregated by school without disclosing identities. One such teacher evaluation method is offering an opportunity for teachers to videotape themselves according to a set format. These tapes could be reviewed by senior teachers for rating as "Meritorious", "Acceptable" or "Needing Improvement." These "scores" could generate a school mean.

Parental involvement should be defined and measured. The percent of parents that come to a school is poorly documented and not sufficient. Much debate is needed over the definition of involvement. It seems that parents can be involved in their child's education at home.

The most obvious need for these profiles is a much better presentation. Broward County Schools, for example, describes variables fully instead of just reporting them. We need to do a better job of explaining data.

Jaeger's study (1993) compared several presentation formats to parents (the public relations sector) and to school board members (the accountability sector). He found that school board members wanted test score data with district and state comparisons succinctly displayed. Easy to read and understand charts and graphs with a minimum of narrative were preferred. Parents wanted a broader range of information, preferring a longer, more descriptive report.

While the profiles developed for Springfield Public Schools were created to help SCDMTs produce an effective SIP, the profiles can be modified for use as either a public relations tool or a means to hold a school accountable. One way the profiles could be used for public relations would be to select one particular variable and periodically publish a "report card" showing both the status and change of that profile variable. The report could also highlight some school as the "School of the Month" for exemplary performance on that variable.

References

Collins, J. et al, The Case for Local School Indicators. Massachusetts Association of School Committees, March, 1991.

Jaeger, R.M. et al, A Consumer Report on School Report Cards. Center for Educational Research and Evaluation, University of North Carolina, 1993.

Kaagan , S.S. and Coley, R.J., State Educational Indicators: Measuring Strides, Missing Steps. ETS, 1989.

Spillane, R.R., Profile. Fairfax County Public Schools, 1989.

Webster, W.J. and Edwards, M.E., An Accountability System for School Improvement. (Dallas ISD), AREA, Atlanta, 1993.

Appendix

Items on the General Survey of School Climate

1. TEACHERS IN THIS SCHOOL LIKE THEIR STUDENTS
2. TEACHERS DO NOT GIVE STUDENTS THE GRADES THEY DESERVE
3. TEACHERS HELP STUDENTS TO BE FRIENDLY TO EACH OTHER
4. TEACHERS TREAT EACH STUDENT AS AN INDIVIDUAL
5. TEACHERS ARE PATIENT WHEN A STUDENT HAS TROUBLE LEARNING
6. TEACHERS MAKE EXTRA EFFORTS TO HELP STUDENTS
7. TEACHERS UNDERSTAND AND MEET THE NEEDS OF EACH STUDENT
8. TEACHERS ARE FAIR TO STUDENTS
9. STUDENTS USUALLY FEEL SAFE IN THE SCHOOL BUILDING
10. PEOPLE ARE AFRAID TO COME TO THIS SCHOOL IN THE EVENING
11. CLASSROOMS ARE NOT USUALLY CLEAN AND NEAT
12. THE SCHOOL BUILDING IS KEPT CLEAN AND NEAT
13. THE SCHOOL BUILDING IS KEPT IN GOOD REPAIR
14. THE PRINCIPAL IN THIS SCHOOL LISTENS TO STUDENT IDEAS
15. THE PRINCIPAL TALKS OFTEN WITH TEACHERS AND PARENTS
16. THE PRINCIPAL SETS A GOOD EXAMPLE BY WORKING HARD
17. TEACHERS AND STUDENTS HELP TO MAKE SCHOOL DECISIONS
18. STUDENTS DO NOT UNDERSTAND WHY THEY ARE IN SCHOOL
19. STUDENTS HERE ARE NOT INTERESTED IN LEARNING NEW THINGS
20. STUDENTS IN THIS SCHOOL HAVE FUN BUT ALSO WORK HARD
21. IF A STUDENT MAKES FUN OF SOMEONE, OTHERS JOIN IN
22. STUDENTS ARE WELL-BEHAVED EVEN WHEN THEY ARE NOT WATCHED
23. COUNSELORS HELP STUDENTS PLAN FOR THEIR FUTURE
24. STUDENTS GET GOOD ADVICE FROM TEACHERS OR COUNSELORS
25. STUDENTS DO NOT RESPECT EACH OTHER IN THIS SCHOOL
26. MOST STUDENTS WANT TO BE FRIENDS WITH ONE ANOTHER
27. STUDENTS HAVE A SENSE OF BELONGING IN THIS SCHOOL
28. MOST PARENTS DO NOT ATTEND SCHOOL CONFERENCES
29. PARENT ATTENDANCE AT SCHOOL MEETINGS AND PROGRAMS IS GOOD
30. THERE IS A CLEAR SET OF RULES FOR STUDENTS TO FOLLOW
31. TEACHERS HAVE TOO MANY CLERICAL TASKS TO DO
32. TEACHERS SPEND MOST TIME TALKING AND EXPLAINING THINGS
33. STUDENTS IN THIS SCHOOL DO NOT USUALLY HAVE HOMEWORK
34. TEACHERS USE CLASS TIME TO HELP STUDENTS WITH THEIR WORK
35. TOO MUCH CLASSROOM TIME IS WASTED BY FOOLING AROUND
36. THERE ARE ALMOST NO OUTSIDE INTERRUPTIONS OF THE CLASS
37. STUDENTS DO NOT FEEL SAFE IN THIS SCHOOL STAYING LATE
38. THIS SCHOOL HAS ALMOST NO AFTER-SCHOOL ACTIVITIES
39. STUDENTS CAN BE IN SPORTS, MUSIC, ETC. EVEN WITHOUT TALENT
40. STUDENTS CAN TAKE PART IN ACTIVITIES NO MATTER THE COST